

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	TION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/615,804 07/10/2003		07/10/2003	Hideyuki Yamakawa	008312-0304796	1903	
909	7590	02/25/2004		EXAMINER		
		HROP, LLP	JEAN PIERI	JEAN PIERRE, PEGUY		
P.O. BOX 1 MCLEAN,		2	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			2819	2819		

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N	o.	Applicant(s)				
		10/615,804		YAMAKAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit				
	-	Peguy JeanPi		2819				
	The MAILING DATE of this communi	0,			is			
Period f	or Reply							
THE - External control	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI MISSION OF THIS COMMUNI STATE OF THIS COMMUNITY OF THIS COMMUNIT	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, he unication. 0) days, a reply within the statutory is tutory period will apply and will expi will, by statute, cause the applicatio	owever, may a reply be time minimum of thirty (30) days ire SIX (6) MONTHS from th n to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. ne mailing date of this commun (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>10 July 2003</i> .						
• —	•	2b)⊠ This action is non-f	inal.					
3)□								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	1) Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	re withdrawn from consid	eration.					
5)[	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,5 and 10</u> is/are rejected.							
-	Claim(s) <u>2-4,6-9 and 11-14</u> is/are objected to.							
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or election requi	rement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b) c	bjected to by the E	xaminer.				
	Applicant may not request that any object	÷, ,						
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including							
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note t	he attached Office /	Action or form PTO-1	52.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation  See the attached detailed Office action	documents have been re documents have been re of the priority documents nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17	ceived. ceived in Applicatio have been received 7.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stag	ge			
Attachmer	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) [	☐ Interview Summary (	PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Noti	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P	TO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Dat	te,				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or er No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/9/04</u> .		Notice of Informal Pa Other:	tent Application (PTO-152	<b>)</b>			

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/615,804

Art Unit: 2819

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# **Priority**

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed on 7/10/2003 has been considered.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 5. Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makansi et al. (USP 6,157,325).

Application/Control Number: 10/615,804

Art Unit: 2819

Makanski discloses in Figures 1 and 2 an information storage medium that uses multiple codes to increase the storage capacity of a recording device. Figure 1 discloses a disk storage subsystem in which a plurality of code sequences are to be recorded on a plurality of successive sub-fields (3) of the information storage medium. The system uses a plurality of run length limited code (RLL) of the d, k type and the data are encoded under (2,7) or (1,7) or any other RLL codes that can increase the storage capacity (see col. 3, lines 49-56). The 2, 7 code can be used as the first code and the 1, 7 code as the second that leads to a decrease in the minimum run length (see claim 4; col. 2, lines 39-43).

Makanski does not explicitly disclose that the recording densities gradually become higher. However, it is to be noted that "d" or minimum run of "0" between consecutive "1" is gradually decreasing (d=2, 1...) and consequently, the recording density is increasing and/or the storage capacity is increasing. Therefore, any artisan having working knowledge in the art would have known that decreasing the minimum run length of the code sequence will definitely lead to an increase of the recording density and thereby providing a more efficient recording system.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record does not teach the limitations of generating a plurality of

Application/Control Number: 10/615,804

Art Unit: 2819

different code sequences on the basis of a plurality of different run length limitations which gradually decrease a minimum run length of identical codes.

## Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kahlman (USP 6,157,325), Kim (USP 6,188,336) and Shimpuku et al. (USP 5,432,799) disclose the use of RLL code in recording medium.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peguy JeanPierre whose telephone number is (571) 272-1803. The examiner fax phone number is (571) 273-1803.

Peguy JeanPierre Primary Examiner